DOCUMENT RESUME

AC 003 783

ED 031 618

"Trainers of Trainers' Workshops" in Adult Basic Education and Subsequent Grant Activity. Final Report.

Maryland Univ., College Park. Center of Adult Education.

Spons Agency-Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Pub Date Dec 66
Note-57p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.95
Descriptors-*Adult Basic Education, Chief Administrators, College Faculty, Financial Support, Followup Studies, Program Evaluation, Publications, Supervisors, *Teacher Education, Teacher Evaluation, *Trainers, *Workshops
Identifiers-Ford Foundation

Sponsored by the Ford Foundation, workshops for trainers of trainers of teachers in adult basic education were held in the summer of 1965 at the Universities of New Mexico, Maryland, and Washington. Administrators, supervisors, university faculty, and teachers (155 in all) were trained; each workshop had its own approach and developed its own evaluation. The University of Maryland was granted supplemental funds from the Ford Foundation to perform a nationwide evaluation of participants several months after the workshops and an evaluation of the trainers and teachers trained by them. In addition, a "Guide for Teacher-Trainers in Adult Basic Education" was published by the National Association for Public School Adult Education (NAPSAE) in early 1966; it is a blending of the materials generated by all three workshops. Unexpended funds under the original workshop project have been transferred to NAPSAE to service an office of coordinator of adult basic education training activities. (eb)

EDO 31618

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

"TRAINERS OF TRAINERS' WORKSHOPS" IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION AND SUBSEQUENT GRANT ACTIVITY

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
College Park, Maryland
20740

FINAL REPORT

"TRAINERS OF TRAINERS' WORKSHOPS"

IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

AND

SUBSEQUENT GRANT ACTIVITY

Sponsor: Ford Foundation

Grant Period: April, 1965 to December, 1966

University of Maryland

Conferences and Institutes Division
University College
Center of Adult Education

December 13, 1966

PREFACE

The Ford Foundation workshops for trainers of trainers in adult basic education held in the Summer 1965 made a major contribution to the field. The Workshops had a far-ranging impact: a "Guide for Teacher Trainers in Adult Basic Education" was published as a result of the Workshops; a nation-wide evaluation of the impact of the program upon the participants and those whom they trained in the states was performed; and finally, new direction was given to the field of adult basic education as a result of the work of those who attended the Summer 1965 Workshops. This work will be continued through the establishment of an office of coordinator of adult basic education training activities serviced through the NAPSAE, Washington, D. C. office.

There were many who helped to make this project successful, including the Workshops' 155 participants; the administrative staff and the resource people who devoted long hours to the Workshops themselves; U.S. Office of Education consultants; the ever-present cooperation and insight brought to the project by Mr. Robert Luke and the NAPSAE, Washington, D. C. staff; the long, tedious hours which the staff of the Conferences and Institutes Division dedicated to the project; and finally, the continued confidence which Dr. Stanley Drazek and Dr. Donald Deppe placed in me to carry out the dictates of the grant.

Leonard P. Oliver
Senior Conference Coordinator
University of Maryland
Center of Adult Education

and

Project Administrator
Ford Foundation Workshops
in Adult Basic Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
PREFACE	. . . . .	ii.
I.	REVIEW OF THE PROJECT AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIVITIES	1
II.	THE SUPPLEMENTAL GRANT PROGRAM	4
III.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	28
IV.	THE NAPSAE PROJECT FOR THE CONTINUATION OF THE WORK OF THE 1965 "TRAINER OF TRAINERS' WORKSHOPS" IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION	37
V.	PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY	38
APPENDIX A.	SUMMER 1965 WORKSHOPS' PARTICIPANT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	40
APPENDIX B.	STATE WORKSHOPS' PARTICIPANT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	44
APPENDIX C.	NAPSAE PROPOSAL	48

FINAL REPORT

"TRAINER OF TRAINERS' WORKSHOPS" IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION SUMMER 1965

I. REVIEW OF THE PROJECT AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIVITIES

Workshops for trainers of trainers of teachers in adult basic education were held in the summer of 1965 at three locations throughout the country under a grant from the Ford Foundation. The Workshops were conducted at the University of New Mexico, the University of Maryland, and through the Seattle, Washington Public School System at the University of Washington. One hundred and fifty-five administrators, supervisors, university faculty, and teachers were trained to handle the task of training trainers and teachers in their states in adult basic education. Each Workshop had its own approach to the preparation of these trainers and teachers, but in general, the participants were given the techniques, methods, materials, and sociological-psychological information necessary to allow them to train those in their states who would be working with the undereducated adult. The three Workshops established a nucleus of well-trained professionals to assist in the implementation of Title II B of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Adult Basic Education).

Each Workshop developed its own evaluation, and these evaluations were administered to the participants at the end of each Workshop. However,

it was deemed necessary to perform a nation-wide evaluation of those who attended the Workshops, preferably several months after they had returned to their states and after they had an opportunity to apply the information gained in the Workshops. The University of Maryland was granted supplemental funds from the Ford Foundation to perform this nation-wide evaluation of those who attended the Summer 1965 Workshops, and to perform an additional evaluation of the trainers and teachers who were trained by them.

In addition to the evaluations mentioned above, a "Guide for Teacher-Trainers in Adult Basic Education" (Washington, D.C.: NAPSAE, 1966) was published in early 1966. This Guide was a blending of the materials generated by all three Workshops. It has served as the first basic reference for those who are doing teacher-training in adult basic education, and as a standard reference for each participant in the 1966 Workshops in Teacher-Training held under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education in cooperation with the National University Extension Association (NUEA). The Guide has become a "bible" in the field, and it is a worthy first attempt to bring together some of the diverse views on approaching the training of teachers in adult basic education.

There were other indications of the success of the Summer 1965 Workshops in addition to the Guide and the evaluations. State teacher-training workshops under Title II B were directly influenced by those who attended the Summer 1965 Workshops; more adult-oriented materials were published by commercial publishers as a result of pressure from the Workshops' participants;

many participants formed close bonds which resulted in exchanges of information on programs, new projects, research, evaluation, and other current and projected developments; the course of legislation in the 89th Congress in favor of adult basic education was influenced; and finally, there arose from the Workshop experience a sense of professionalism in the field of adult basic education which was not evident prior to 1965.

The series of regional teacher-training workshops, funded by the U.S. Office of Education and conducted in cooperation with the NUEA at selected universities throughout the country, included many of those who participated in the Summer 1965 Workshops. The Summer 1965 Workshops' participants played important roles in the 1966 teacher-training workshops as administrators, consultants, resource staff, and participants.

The effects of the Summer 1965 Workshops in adult basic education will be felt for many years in the field of adult basic education. This fastest growing area of education was in dire need of a stimulus in 1965 to give direction and growth to an area of concern in our country which heretofore has been sadly neglected. With the new resources made available by the federal government to combat the problem of undereducation among our adult citizens, and with the new personnel, methods, materials, techniques, and innovations which are appearing daily in the field, the Summer 1965 Workshops will stand as an important milestone in the history of Ame ica's attempt to eradicate functional illiteracy.

II. THE SUPPLEMENTAL GRANT PROGRAM

A. "Guide for Teacher-Trainers in Adult Basic Education"

Materials for a guide for teacher-trainers were solicited from all three Workshops. These materials were submitted to NAPSAE headquarters for compilation, editing, and publication. The result was the highly-commended "Guide for Teacher-Trainers in Adult Basic Education" published in the spring of 1966. Copies of the Guide were sent to all state directors of adult education, to the participants in the Summer 1965 Workshops, to the 960 teachers and supervisors who attended the U.S. Office of Education - NUEA Teacher-Training Workshops in the summer of 1966, and to other interested teacher-trainers who requested copies. Subsequent editions of this publication will be published directly through NAPSAE headquarters. The Guide contains an evaluation form, and based on this field evaluation and on subsequent developments in the area of adult basic education, new editions have been promised. Credit should go to the NAPSAE headquarters' staff, especially Mrs. Virginia Warren, for their admirable efforts in publishing this Guide.

B. Evaluation

Evaluation instruments were designed by an independent consultant, revised by University of Maryland faculty and staff, and submitted to the field in the summer of 1966. There were two parts to the

evaluation: (1) an evaluation of the participants in the Summer 1965 Workshops; and (2) an evaluation of those trainers and teachers who were trained in the states as a result of the efforts of the Summer 1965 Workshops' participants. These evaluations comprise the first effort to perform a nation-wide evaluation of the results of training of trainers of teachers of adult basic education and of training of the classroom teacher of the undereducated. It must be emphasized that these evaluations are, of course, based upon a limited sample, but the comments of those evaluated are significant for further study. The balance of this report is related to these two evaluations.

1. Evaluation of the Summer 1965 Workshops' Participants

The Participant Evaluation Questionnaire (Appendix A) was sent to the participants in the Summer 1965 Workshops in adult basic education. There were 70 questionnaires returned in the period May to October, 1966, and these returns represent at least 50 percent of the participants of each of the three Workshops. The summary of these returns is divided into three parts: (a) Who are the trainers?; (b) How effective was the training which they received?; and (c) What are the major unresolved problems in the field of adult basic education?

a. Who are the trainers?

Question 1. What is your current responsibility in adult basic education?

Of those responding, 70 percent are administrators, supervisors, or teacher-trainers in adult basic education. A few (5%) are not involved in adult basic education, while the others are teachers, researchers, or involved in other ways in adult basic education programs. This would indicate that the majority of those who participated in the Summer 1965 Workshops continued in adult basic education in administrative roles, thus fulfilling the role foreseen for them at the time of the Summer 1965 Workshops.

b. How effective was the training which they received?

Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9 are related to the participant evaluation of the effectiveness of the training which they received in the Summer 1965 Workshops.

Question 2. Which Workshop did you attend?

Of the 70 responses, 50 percent of the participants in each workshop were represented on the questionnaire. (New Mexico: 8; Seattle, Washington: 12; University of Maryland: 50). These data indicate that the sampling is valid in that all three Workshops are well represented on the final tabulation.

Question 3. What is your present recollection of the primary objectives of that Workshop?

Several persons responded to more than one of the categories. Of the 70 responses, 63 recalled that the primary objective of their Workshop was "to prepare me to train teachers to teach adults."

Other objectives frequently mentioned (more than 10 times) were: "to help me to supervise teaching programs in adult basic education," "to help me to understand disadvantaged adults," and "to give me administrative skills in adult basic education." The responses indicate that the objectives as set by the Workshops' planners were the objectives which were accepted in almost every case by the Workshops' participants.

Question 4. To what extent did the Workshop meet these objectives?

Of the 70 replies, 55 felt that the Workshop which they attended met the objectives recalled "quite well" or "completely."

Question 5. Indicate the greatest strengths and the greatest weaknesses of the Workshop.

The responses to these two questions were open-ended, and only those responses which appeared seven or more times (10%) are listed below. The relative frequencies are also indicated.

Strengths

Comment	Relative Frequency
Well-planned organization	20/70
Involvement of participants	15/70
Named a specific speaker or resource person	12/70
Named a second specific speaker or resource person	11/70
Exchange of ideas	9/70
New teaching techniques	8/70
Facilities	8/70
Use of materials	7/70
Reports, demonstrations, etc.	7/70
Cooperation and coordination	7/70

Weaknesses

Comment	Relative Frequency
Lack of information about undereducated adults	13/70
Too much material	12/70
Participants not working effectively together	10/70
Sessions too long	10/70
Poor organization	9/70
Goals not clear	8/70

It must be remembered that there was no correlation made between those who made the above comments and the Workshop which they attended. These comments, therefore, have to be taken as favorable comments and criticisms in general of the three Workshops. Thus, these points should be considered in designing future training programs in adult basic education.

Question 6. How much of the ideas and methods of the Summer 1965 Workshops was transferable?

Of the 70 responses, 52 (73%) reported that "all" or "much" of the ideas and methods of the Workshop was transferable to their work with the adult undereducated. Only 6 of the 70 responding reported "little" or "none" of the information was transferable to their work.

Question 9. Program Content.

The following information is based on a response to a specific item equal to or greater than 30 percent (21/70).

Program Content	Relative Frequency
"Good"	
Curricula for training teachers in adult basic education. . .	42/70
Availability of sample curricular materials	35/70
Use of audio-visual aids	35/70
Reading.	34/70
Teacher training methods	34/70
Recruitment of students	33/70
Psychology-sociology of the undereducated.	33/70
Exposure to methods of teaching adult basic education . . .	30/70
Selection of materials	30/70
Bibliographies and library materials	30/70
Recruitment of teachers	25/70
Motivation and retention of students	22/70
"Poor"	
Review and interpretation of research.	36/70
Consumer education.	30/70
Citizenship	24/70
Arithmetic.	23/70
Job orientation	21/70

All other areas on the evaluation form, based on a response equal to or greater than 30 percent, were listed as "fair." The responses indicate that the areas other than reading, i.e., areas which involve helping the undereducated adult to fully function in society, need much more emphasis in future training programs. There is also a continuing need for research, as the responses show.

c. What are the major unresolved problems in the field of adult basic education?

Questions 7, 8, and 10 apply to this topic.

Question 7. Since the Workshop, what new needs have you noted or become aware of through your activities in adult basic education that were not dealt with in the Workshop?

The following items were based on a response noted 7 or more times (10%).

New Needs	Relative Frequency
Better evaluation methods	10/70
Need for qualified (certified) teachers	10/70
More effective means of reaching adults	9/70
More depth on material	8/70
Continuous workshops for new methods of teaching	7/70
Lack of reference or handbook material	7/70
More practical counseling methods for working with adults	7/70

There is repeated concern over the lack of evaluation, research, and the dissemination of new information on almost all aspects of adult basic education.

Question 8. How can subsequent workshops for trainers of teachers be made more effective in terms of the following? (Participants were asked to make one comment under each heading.)

Area of Concern		Comment	Relative Frequency
a.	Length of time devoted to the institute	2 weeks	33/70
		1 week (concentrated)	21/70
b.	Choice of personnel to attend	Similar type people (e.g., State Departments)	20/70
		Knowledgeable personnel such as teachers and administrators	18/70
c.	Method of presentation of materials	Actual demonstration and display	11/70
d.	Area or topic reasonably dropped	None	39/70 (none strongly mentioned)
e.	Area of topic which should be included	None	16/70
		(27 topics were mentioned 1 to 5 times)	
f.	Choice of resource persons	Those actually engaged in adult basic education	16/70
		No change	16/70
		Any regional or national person responsible for adult basic education programs	16/70

Question 10. What is the major unresolved problem you face in training teachers of the adult undereducated?

The following responses appeared at least 7 or more times (10%).

Unresolved Problems	Relative Frequency
Outdated teaching methods and teachers	11/70
Recruitment of teachers	11/70
Insufficient budget	10/70
Not enough pay for teachers	9/70
Keeping teachers qualified	9/70
Being forced to train teachers in spare time	7/70
Lack of materials and equipment	7/70
Insufficient course offerings	7/70
Proper communication to keep current in the field	7/70

There is a great desire for new methods, new materials, and additional insights on the motivation and recruitment of the undereducated. The problems associated with the lack of adequate budgets are also frequently mentioned.

There were many significant comments listed under Question 10. Some of the more important are listed below. They are indicative of the general feeling of the field for what still has to be done to advance local and state programs of adult basic education.

1. "We need full-time facilities for adult education and also full-time teachers." (Program Specialist -- Adult Basic Education)

2. "One source is needed to gain information on current and new developments in the field of adult basic education." (State Supervisor of Adult Education)

3. "The major problem is retention and motivation. We have no real goals such as being able to give the students an adequate assurance of employment." (Public Schools - Assistant in Adult Education)

4. "Getting the school system to conceive of and implement something more than a retread of old high school equivalency evening programs." (University faculty)

5. "If the adult basic education program is to succeed, more involvement with the college and university must take place in the area of training teachers to be better equipped to teach reading to the undereducated." (Community Adult Education Program)

6. "Adult basic education needs its own supply of teachers." (State Supervisor of Adult Education)

7. "Most in-service training comes through an exchange of correspondence, bulletins, newspapers, professional materials, films, etc., and not through formal in-service training programs." (State Education Specialist)

8. "The colleges need to encourage promising young people to choose teaching situations which are in disadvantaged areas. At the same time, it is necessary for colleges to develop meaningful courses which will give students an understanding of the particular problems that this kind of teaching presents. Stress should be placed on a good background in sociology, psychology, and anthropology. The teaching of the adult basic undereducated requires a special type of teacher and a special type of attitude." (Supervising Teacher -- MDTA)

9. "Convincing the Bureau of Adult Education, State Department of Education, and the local administrations and the local Boards of Education of the importance of teacher-training to the point where they will provide ample funds to conduct meaningful, productive teacher-training programs. They all seem to have the attitude that a short workshop (15 to 30 hours duration) is entirely adequate and that any necessary follow-up can be handled by the local school system (State Department attitude). Or, that such a workshop is adequate and any necessary follow-up should be provided by the State Dept. of Education (local school attitude). In short, buck-passing by the agencies responsible for funding teacher-training." (State Adult Basic Education Consultants)

10. "Quality control instructional systems are virtually impossible to organize because of the time-consuming task of retaining teachers." (College of Education -- Assistant Dean)

11. "More should be done in evaluation--both of the student and of the existing program." (Chairman - University Department of Teacher Education)

12. "An evaluation of the multitude of tests available in the field." (Supervisor of Local Adult Basic Education Program)

13. "Keeping up to date in the field." (State Director of Adult Education)

14. "Short, easily administered tests--particularly for replacement and achievement whose vocabulary is geared to adults." (Local Director)

15. "To get the teachers to accept the reality that adult basic is not elementary education." (State Consultant in Adult Basic Education)

16.

A. "How to get teachers to innovate--try the new--both materials and equipment."

B. "People-oriented teachers in adult basic education, with empathy and enthusiasm that is of some length of duration."

C. "Holding teachers and other personnel when financing fluctuates is cut or does not permit on-going programs to continue." (State Consultant in Adult Basic Education)

17. "Meeting the needs of the younger undereducated adult." (Supervisor, Adult Basic Education - MDTA)

18. "Identification of qualified teacher-training staff who have theoretical knowledge, but who are also able to communicate their skills." (Assistant Professor - College of Education)

19. "More effective ways of reaching adults who need our help (how do we make them aware that we have something to offer which they need)." (Local School District - Supervisor of Adult Basic Education)

20. "Traditional teachers with traditional methods who cannot take time to participate in in-service training activities." (Local School District Supervisor of Adult Basic Education)

21. "Realistic personnel who have actually worked in adult basic education to give us practical guidance and suggestions--not college trained people who have a textbook approach and their 'heads in the clouds'." (County School District - Director Special Education Services)

22. "As a state supervisor of adult basic education, I cannot contract to a university to teacher-train for 1/10 of our state allocation. Therefore, I have to do the job." (State Supervisor of Adult Basic Education)

23. "Greater coordination among the local agencies involved in adult basic education." (Assistant Professor of Education and Director of Field Experiences)

24. "A 'team' approach to the training of teachers of the adult undereducated is needed. This team would be made up of highly qualified persons working as a team under the direction of a coordinator." (Professor of Education)

25. "The major problem faced in my state is selling the idea of adult basic education to local school boards and districts. We believe that if we had the support of a substantial number of the recognized or consolidated school districts in our state, and with proper preparation, we would find eager students in practically every district." (Adult Basic Education Teacher-Trainer - State)

26. "When the teachers are exposed to the differences between grade school and adult teaching--they become excellent students. We miss many teachers who conclude that it just isn't necessary. A credit system would help if we could get the colleges and universities to accept teachers for credit in adult basic education, more teachers would be interested." (State Director - Adult Basic Education)

27. "Proper diagnostic testing, and the need to develop individualized reading programs with a wide array of materials that will help the undereducated student." (Assistant Principal -- Local High School)

28. "The lack of standardization of qualifications for teachers of the undereducated adult is a major, as yet, unresolved problem. There is a dire need for uniform programs of pre-service and in-service training for teachers of adults similar to those set up for teachers of elementary school children, high school students, and college students." (Big City Coordinator of Teacher-Training in Adult Basic Education)

29. "Lack of concern of local educators regarding the need of adult basic education in the area, and getting local educators involved in recruitment of adult basic education students." (State Supervisor of Adult Basic Education)

30. "The state-supported colleges and universities are not offering courses for training teachers of adults. Nor are they offering training to teachers for guidance of adults with less than a high school education." (Assistant State Director of Adult Education)

31. "My greatest concern in adult education is to develop ways of helping professional teachers to relax with adults, and to let the adult student learn how to take some responsibility for his own education. There is more to adult basic education than learning the 3 R's, as we need to know how to help students plan for themselves and for their families. The traditional curriculum could be the vehicle with which we could teach adults how to go about living in our society." (Supervisor of Elementary Education - State Prison)

32. "The uncertainty of funding and directives from Washington has caused serious difficulties with money and with timing for workshop arrangements. The major unresolved problem is the handling of total illiterates who seem to be retarded. Is the use of IQ tests permissible?" (Teacher)

33. "How to start classes of adult basic education in large manufacturing companies which employ undereducated people. The need for continuous workshops to learn of new methods of teaching and to evaluate materials that are newly offered almost all of the time." (City Supervisor of Special Education)

34. "There is a lack of time on the part of teachers who are primarily doing adult basic education as an extra-time vocation."

"We also find that we must include more time in our workshops for developing techniques of diagnosing the reading skill inadequacies in order to make lessons meaningful to students. This, of course, is dependent on the use of grouping techniques within the homogenous groups."

"We have been trying to develop a better understanding of the objectives of adult basic education on the part of teachers--especially the importance of developing a curriculum which is interesting and progmatic for this segment of the population." (Associate Supervisor of State Adult Basic Education Programs)

35. "Teachers should be allowed the time to participate in in-service adult basic education training programs, and they should be paid for attending." (Consultant in Adult Basic Education, State Department of Education)

The above comments represent a sampling of some of the more important problem areas which were discussed on the questionnaires. Several major problem areas stand out as one reads the above list, including the need for research and evaluation; the need for qualified teachers who can empathise with the adult undereducated; the need for more money and for more time to train teachers; the need for a pragmatic curriculum which will reach the undereducated; the need to bring the hard facts of the problems of the undereducated adult to the attention of the local power structures; and finally, the need to involve the community in a broad-based program.

Based on the above comments, it seems that the university educators are very concerned with research and evaluation of adult basic education programs. If the universities and colleges become involved, more work will be accomplished in these areas. On the other hand, those who are administering adult basic education funds and programs in the field are more concerned about their existing programs, the generation of new programs, and funding for both. The problem may be one of reconciling the field's pragmatic interests in action programs with the universities' interest in research, evaluation, and teacher-training. There was no mention of the use of "teacher-aides" in the adult basic education classroom, but this also seems to be an area where much more work could be done.

2. Evaluation of the Trainers and Teachers Trained in the States

A second part of the evaluation procedure was to determine who the persons were who were trained by the participants of the Summer 1965 Workshops, their opinions of their training, and what they considered to be the essential problems still to be met in the field of adult basic education. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first nation-wide survey of those personnel who are in direct contact with the adult basic education classroom. The results, therefore, should have interesting implications for policy in the field of adult basic education and for further follow-up surveys.

Of the 5,000 questionnaires sent to those trained in the states (Appendix B), 1500 returns were received from May to October, 1966. The results were computer tabulated, and the following analysis is a result of this survey. As in Part 1, the responses were designed to answer the three questions: (a) Who are the persons trained by the Summer 1965 Workshop's trainers?; (b) How effective was the training which they received?; and (c) What do they perceive as the unresolved problems in adult basic education?

(a) Who are the persons trained by the 1965 Workshops' trainers?

The responses to Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 12, 14, 16, 17, and 18 give some indication of who the trainees are.

Question 12. Current position in adult basic education.

Of the 1500 responses, the greatest majority were teachers (64.1%), supervisors (14.1%), and counselors (4.0%).

Question 2. Training Agency and Institution.

The majority of those who responded to the questionnaires (71.6%) were trained either by the state department of education or by the local school system. Colleges or universities served as training institutions for 23.3 percent of those responding. This breakdown would roughly approximate the "mix" of trainers in the Summer 1965 Workshops. It is interesting to note that almost one-fourth of these responding were trained by a university or college.

Question 3. and 4. Are you employed in an adult basic education program?

Of those responding, 78.6 percent were employed in an adult basic education program, with 25 percent employed full time, and 75 percent employed part time. These responses would seem to substantiate the findings in the evaluation of the trainers, where the recurring theme was the problem of part-time teachers, part-time training, and insufficient funds and time to establish full-time training programs and to train full-time classroom teachers.

Question 5. Age

The great majority of those trained were between the ages of 31 and 60 (76.2%). However, 6 percent of those responding were between the ages of 21 and 25, and 5 percent were over 60.

This would seem to indicate that the teachers, supervisors, and counselors who were working directly with the adult undereducated, according to this sample, are experienced, mature adults who have probably had many years of experience in education, although not especially with adults. This is further borne out in the responses to Question 14, where a high percentage of those responding had extensive experience in the elementary school grades and secondary grades 7 to 9.

Question 8. College degrees held.

The bachelor's degree was held by 47 percent of those who responded, and the master's by 45 percent, again emphasizing the point that those in the field who are in close contact with the classroom situation are primarily experienced educators with either a bachelor's or a master's degree, primarily in the field of education (Question 9--Major area of university training--was not officually tabulated, but the vast majority of those who responded to Question 9 specified that their major area of university training was education).

Question 14. Teaching experience by grade.

Most of the respondees reacted to more than one of the areas listed under Question 14, indicating that they had teaching experience at various grade levels. The following data are offered to show the vast range of experience which they bring to the adult basic education classroom.

Grade Level	% of 1500 Responses Replying to Each Item
Pre-school	9.4%
Grades 1 through 3	40.9%
Grades 4 through 6	56.2%
Grades 7 through 9	56.1%
Grades 10 through 12	36.8%
College experience	8.4%
Supervisory experience	17.2%

It should be noted that the totals do not add to 100 percent because each item was tabulated separately because of the multiple responses. As indicated above, a high percentage of those responding to each item had experience in elementary grades. Many had experience in the secondary grades 7 through 9, with fewer who had senior high experience in grades 10 through 12, and even fewer who had college experience in teaching. A substantial number (17.2%) responded to the item "Supervisory experience." These responses correlate with the high degree of part-time teachers in adult basic education, many of whom have had extensive experience in supervision and teaching, especially at the elementary levels. The need for full-time supervisors and teachers who have worked with adults is evident.

Question 16. Do you hold an active teaching certificate or license?

Again, the response to Question 16 correlates with the experience factor which has been brought out in several prior questions, as 94 percent of those replying hold an active teaching certificate or license.

If the sample is valid, the protests of those who claim that teachers of the adult undereducated do not have teaching certificates or licenses would seem to be unfounded. The vast majority of those responding in this sample have had extensive teaching experience and hold a certificate or license. They also have a bachelor's or a master's degree.

Question 17. Have you ever been a volunteer in an adult basic education program?

A great majority (67%) of those responding has never volunteered in adult basic education programs. Therefore, one could conclude that the majority of those who are teaching in adult basic education, based on this sample, were active supervisors or teachers who transferred some of their normal load to working with the adult undereducated. This would seem to substantiate the comments of many of the administrators of adult basic education programs who are concerned that their full-time supervisors and teachers are being used in adult basic education programs on a part-time basis, thus placing additional burdens upon the participating supervisors, the teachers, and the school system.

Question 18. How many years have you worked with the undereducated adult?

The responses to Question 18 correlate with the findings in Question 14 where it was found that a high percentage of those responding

had had extensive teaching experience in the elementary and secondary grades. Over 87 percent of those responding to Question 18 had either no experience or between 1 and 5 years' experience with the undereducated adult. Very few of those responding had more than 5 years' experience in working with the adult undereducated, again emphasizing the relatively nascent state in which the field of adult basic education finds itself. The responses to Question 18 also imply that many of those participating in adult basic education programs are, in effect, "retreaded" elementary and secondary school teachers.

(b) <u>How effective was the training which they received</u>?

Over 50 percent of those responding had attended other adult basic education training programs. This would indicate that much of the training conducted by the Summer 1965 Workshops' participants was of the in-service variety. Questions 21, 22, 13, and 19 apply.

Question 21. What was the length of the adult basic education program in which you participated?

Almost 40 percent of those responding attended training programs of between 1 and 20 hours and another 25 percent attended programs which were over 80 hours in length. Those attending programs between 1 and 20 hours could have attended one-day-a-week sessions, one-night-a-week sessions, a three-day session, or some similar short-term training format.

Those attending programs of over 80 hours in duration were probably of three to four weeks' duration.

Question 22. Was this training period adequate?

The responses to Question 22 indicate that over 57 percent of those responding thought that the training which they received was either "very adequate" or "moderately adequate." If correlated with the responses to Question 21, the indication is that a week's training is too short, because the majority of those responding to Question 21 (65%) participated in very short training programs (less than 1 week) or in very long training programs (2 weeks or more).

Question 13. How well do you think the adult basic education program which you attended prepared you for your role in adult basic education?

Again, the responses to Question 13 correlate with the responses to Question 21 and 22 as over 78 percent of those responding thought that the training program which they attended prepared them "very well" or "adequately" for their classroom situation.

Question 19. Organization, operation, and impact of the training program in adult basic education.

The responses to Question 19 have been tabulated according to participant responses in the "good" and "poor" areas of organization, operation, and program content.

Organization, Operation and Program Content	% of Those Responding To These Items
"Good" - (45% or more responded "good" to these items)	
Facilities and arrangements	64.4%
Reading instruction	54.3%
Program content	53.3%
Participant/staff interaction	49.9%
Availability of materials	48.3%
Use of teaching materials	45.2%
"Poor" - (15% or more responded "poor" to these items)	
Use of volunteers	31.9%
Use of library	27.4%
Health services available	26.0%
Employment services available	25.9%
Job orientation	21.7%
Welfare services available	21.0%
Consumer education	20.7%
Guidance, counseling, and social service	19.5%
General consultants on teaching methods	17.9%
Use of visual aids	17.9%
Counseling, testing, and guidance of undereducated adults	17.2%
Non-English speaking adults	17.1%
Recruitment of students	15.6%

All other areas not listed could be considered "fair."

There is some correlation of responses to Question 19 with the reaction of the trainers in Part 1 to the program content and organization of the Workshop training program in which they participated. Areas which need to be emphasized more in future adult basic education teacher-training programs include arithmetic, citizenship instruction, consumer education,

and job orientation; the use of teacher-aides; counseling, testing, and guidance of the undereducated adult; recruitment; and the availability and use of supporting resources in the adult basic education program.

(c) What do they perceive as the unresolved problems in adult basic education?

Question 20. What are the major unresolved problems you face in working with the undereducated adult?

Many of those responding checked more than one problem area. The figures presented below show the percentage of the 1500 responding who checked a particular problem. A problem is only listed below if a response was equal to or greater than 20 percent of the total 1500 replies.

Major Unresolved Problem (20% or Greater)	% of Total Responding To This Item
Recruiting of students	43.6%
Proper choice of materials	33.9%
Testing and grouping students	33.5%
Availability of materials	32.5%
Availability of supporting services (health, welfare, employment, etc.)	24.2%
Motivating students	24.0%

It is interesting to note that the problem of availability of materials and supporting services is directly related to the problem of proper budget which was brought out in the trainers' responses (Part 1),

and to the content listed as "poor" under program content in Question 19. There has been a continuing need for more information on materials and a proper evaluation of these materials for the adult basic education classroom, and a continuing need for more research into the problem of recruiting, motivating, and retaining the adult basic education student.

This evaluation questionnaire was an attempt to perform a survey of those who were trained in the states and who are working directly with the adult basic education programs. This is probably the first attempt of this kind to solicit information on adult basic education on a nation-wide scale, and the data can be used as a logical first step in further evaluations.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are brief summary conclusions and policy recommendations which seem to emerge logically from the two field evaluations performed in the spring and summer of 1966. Evaluations were made of both the participants who attended the Summer 1965 Workshops in adult basic education, and the teachers, supervisors, and counselors whom they subsequently trained in their states.

In 1966, there are still more than 8 million men and women in the United States (about 7.5 percent of all Americans 18 years of age and over) who cannot read above a fifth grade level. There is a total of 11 million adults in the United States (about 10 percent of the population age 18 or over) who have completed less than 6 years of school. Since the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, approximately 375,000 adults have been enrolled in adult basic education classes, and a total of $39 million of federal funds has been spent to train them. The conclusions of this final report on the Ford Foundation project in adult basic education reflect the thinking of those in the states who are primarily responsible for the education of these undereducated adults, and who are in the best position to assess the effectiveness of the federally-funded programs in adult basic education, and the gaps which still remain.

A. Information and Coordination

There is a continuing need in the field for information on

what others are doing in adult basic education, including information on successful programs; new approaches to old problems; research and evaluation data on materials, methods, problems of recruitment, motivation, counseling, sociological-psychological background of the disadvantaged; and other factors to better enable those in adult basic education to carry out their program responsibilities.

There is a need for greater coordination of effort in the community to obtain the support of all the local agencies who are involved in adult basic education. In addition, the universities and colleges have to become involved in adult basic education programs, especially in the area of teacher-training and the preparation of administrators and others who will be working with the disadvantaged.

Liaison with the mass media should be established to obtain broad-based support of adult basic education programs. The use of television, especially National Education Television (NET) has barely begun to be exploited for this purpose.

Continuing workshops in adult basic education are needed to bring new information to those who are actively engaged as administrators, supervisors, and teachers in adult basic education programs.

Information on the use of all community services available for the support of adult basic education programs is essential for the proper conduction of these programs. This would include information on welfare services, legal services, consumer education services, employment oppor-

tunity services, library services, and health services in the community.

The local power structure should be made aware of the adult basic education program in the community and every effort should be made to enlist the support of those in positions of leadership for the program.

B. Teacher-Training

Meaningful, productive teacher-training programs with adequate funding should be made available immediately in the field of adult basic education. These programs should be of two or more weeks' duration, and where possible, they should be full-time programs for full-time teachers of the adult undereducated. The data in the report indicate that most of the teacher-training is now, and will continue to be, of the in-service variety. The average teacher in the adult basic education classroom, according to the survey, has had extensive experience in elementary and secondary education, but little experience in the teaching of the adult undereducated. The short-term, one-session-per-week or two-day type programs, have not proven to be successful in the training of teachers of the adult undereducated, according to the survey.

Qualified teachers are necessary to do the job required in adult basic education in the United States. In addition to the experienced teacher who is coming into the field of adult basic education, every effort should be made to attract younger teachers to this fast-growing area of

education considered so vital to the fullest development of the individual in our society.

Most of the teachers surveyed were part-time teachers. It is again emphasized that full-time teachers are needed, teachers with great enthusiasm, with the ability to empathise with disadvantaged adults, with the ability to utilize new methods and materials in approaching these adults, and with the ability to establish a rapport with the student in the adult basic education classroom. "Retreaded" programs are not the answer, that is, programs which are designed to establish high school equivalency for adults and which are not geared to the needs of the disadvantaged adult who comes to the adult basic education classroom. To adequately train these teachers, it is necessary to obtain the fullest involvement of the colleges and universities in our country. (See paragraph on University-College Involvement below.)

The fullest use of the "teacher-aides" should also be explored. This subject was not considered by the respondees to the questionnaires to be a major problem, although the very lack of attention given to this underdeveloped area would indicate that much more work should be done to bring "teacher-aides" into focus as valuable assistants in the adult basic education classrooms.

The type of training which the teachers receive in adult basic education training programs is essential. The responses to the questionnaires indicate that the most significant learning experiences have

taken place when the teacher-trainee was fully involved as a participant in the training program. Most of the teacher-trainees are experienced teachers who have taught in the elementary and secondary grades prior to becoming involved in adult basic education programs. With this wealth of experience, it is essential in the teacher-training program to tap this knowledge and to allow the adult teacher-trainee to guide his own learning process.

C. New Approaches and Insights

Curriculum Developments. -- New approaches are needed in curriculum development to match the adult basic education curriculum to the needs of the adult basic education student. These new approaches should emphasize not only reading and arithmetic, but also the areas of consumer education, orientation to the work world, personal habits, health and family, citizenship, and other areas to make the disadvantaged adult a fully contributing member of society.

Just as the adult teacher-trainee should be allowed to fully participate in his own learning process, so should the adult basic education student be allowed to participate in his own study plan. This involvement of the student in his own learning process is extremely important for the planning which he must do for himself and his family in his life role.

Recruitment, Motivation. -- The indications are that recruitment and motivation of the adult basic undereducated have proceeded at a satisfactory pace. However, there are also implications that recruit-

ment programs in adult basic education are not reaching the "hard core" adult undereducated. Those who come to the adult basic education classroom seem to be already highly motivated, and the problem now may be to establish new methods of reaching those who either refuse to attend adult basic education classes, or who have been out of the reach of the recruitment campaigns. There is a continuing need for research in this area.

Materials, Methods, Testing, Counseling. -- More effective means of reaching the adult undereducated are necessary, including the development of adult-oriented materials; new methods of approaching the disadvantaged in the classroom situation; short, easily administered tests; and better techniques of counseling the disadvantaged. The colleges, universities, and other independent agencies should become more involved in research in these areas, and in the evaluation of existing programs, materials, methods, and tests. More information is also needed on reaching the non-English speaking adults.

D. Funding

The funding of adult basic education programs in our country has been in the past sporadic and often insufficient to match the needs of the state or local area. There seems to be a lack of confidence in the continued support of the federal government for such a vital national effort. If the problem of semi-literacy is to be solved in our country, not only will more funds have to be made available for adult basic education, but the field will have

to gain renewed confidence in federal government funding to continue current programs; to establish new programs; to train more teachers; to draw more students into the classrooms; to establish demonstration projects for the testing and evaluation of materials and methods; and to perform vital research into the problems associated with the disadvantaged.

The involvement of the federal government has to continue if the problem of semi-literacy is to be eliminated. This does not mean, however, that other sources of funding should not be sought. For example, industry has not done its fair share in setting up classes for those members of the labor force who are potential employees. The involvement of the industrial community in the training of the adult undereducated will attain increasing significance as the labor market for skilled personnel becomes tighter in the years to come. Other sources of funds for the adult basic education program should be sought in the community at large, in the local and state government, and in the private foundations.

E. Publicity Campaigns

Strong publicity campaigns are needed at the national, state, and local level to gain broad-based support for adult basic education programs. This support will only be forthcoming if the leadership in our country is aware of the dimensions of the problem of undereducation in our country, and is aware of the continued needs of those who are working to solve the problem. Support for the adult basic education programs

in our country is needed at the highest level of government, just as other programs, such as "Capital Beautification," have received national attention. Every effort should be made to obtain this national support. State and local support is needed to establish the above-mentioned broad-based program in adult basic education. All resources of the state and local area should be mobilized to meet the problems.

F. College-University Involvement

The colleges and universities of our country have, for the most part, denied their responsibility in providing resources for the solution of the problem of the disadvantaged in our society. The state-supported institutions have been especially negligent in the training of resource persons to work with adults who have less than a high school degree. As more and more people are needed to work in disadvantaged areas, the colleges and universities will have to assist in the preparation and training of teachers, trainers, administrators, supervisors, "teacher-aides," and other resource persons to work with the disadvantaged. This requires training in anthropology, sociology, psychology, community development, and other areas which the colleges and universities are uniquely qualified to provide.

In addition, there is a great need for objective research and evaluation of methods, materials, testing, recruitment, motivation, sociological-psychological insights, counseling, and other areas of in-

volvement essential to adult basic education programs.

It is vital that the colleges and universities involve their undergraduates and graduates in degree programs in disciplines affecting the disadvantaged adult.

G. A Unified Effort

Title III of the Amendments to the Elementary Secondary Act of 1965 is known as the "Adult Education Act of 1966." The Act specifically mentions "adult education" as the education of an individual to enable him to read and write in order to maintain a job and to function in society. The Act specifically establishes for the first time the link between our nation's needs in adult basic education, and our nation's responsibility to offer an opportunity to all adults to obtain, at the minimum, the equivalent of a high school education. The task of advancing the frontiers of adult education in the United States is not finished with the passage of the "Adult Education Act of 1966." It begins anew with the Act, and only a unified, national effort will give every adult the opportunity to complete his secondary education.

Specific Recommendations

1. National Service Bureau in Adult Basic Education

There is a need for a National Service Bureau in Adult Basic Education to open and maintain lines of communication with other agencies

and institutions involved in stimulating increased activity in adult basic education, especially in the area of teacher training; development of inventories of materials, programs, and projects; dissemination of this information to the field; stimulation of new ideas and project proposals; research and evaluation in curriculum, methods, recruitment, motivation, and materials, and identification of new resources of funding for projects in adult basic education. This National Service Bureau in Adult Basic Education could be privately financed, but its function should eventually be transferred to a federal agency such as the U.S. Office of Education.

2. Regional Demonstration Centers

Regional demonstration centers are needed to perform staff and teacher-training in adult basic education; research on materials, methods, and other areas of adult basic education; evaluation of programs and materials; use of technological innovations, such as educational television; development of new curricula , especially in non-reading subjects; and other important areas which could be handled by a full time professional staff to constantly advance the frontiers of adult basic education.

3. A National Teacher-Training Institute

It is recommended that a non-federally-financed National Teacher-Training Institute be established to perform the vital functions of teacher-

training in adult basic education. The teachers and supervisors trained in the Institute would receive a certificate after completion of the program. The Institute would be staffed by full-time professionals using modern materials, methods, and technologies to reach the adult undereducated. Experimental classrooms, closed circuit television, a newsletter or perhaps a journal, and constant up-dating of the training processes would be features of the Institute.

4. Demonstration Project for the Development of School Dropouts and Unemployed Classroom Teachers

A demonstration project is needed to determine the feasibility of training school dropouts and unemployed youth to teach the adult undereducated at the beginning stages of adult basic education. These potential teachers would be given extensive training in all aspects of adult basic education, and then be allowed to actually teach in a classroom situation. There is a vast untapped resource in these school dropouts and unemployed as teachers of the adult undereducated. Many of these persons have high IQ levels, but have never been given an opportunity to fully develop their talents. Their instruction would only be at the beginning levels of adult basic education, as advanced students would go into classes with more highly qualified teachers.

5. Demonstration Projects in Industry

Demonstration projects in the training of the adult undereducated

are needed in industrial concerns to demonstrate the efficacy of internal education programs for the raising of the skill level of employees. There should be research projects to demonstrate that this training can be effective, and that this source of potential skilled labor can be trained to fill industrial manpower needs.

IV. THE CONTINUATION OF THE WORK OF THE 1965 "TRAINERS OF TRAINERS' WORKSHOPS" IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

As a result of the Summer 1965 Workshops and the evaluations which were received from the field, the need for a central source to act as a "clearing house" of information for trainers and trainees continues to grow. This need includes the establishment of lines of communication among teacher-training institutions; communication with television programming groups (such as N.E.T.); the development of inventories of instructional materials, programs and projects, and personnel; research and evaluation projects; the generation of new ideas and programs; the identification of new sources of funding, especially non-federal; and the investigation into the possibilities of establishing a national service bureau in adult basic education.

There are many agencies, both public and private, who have expressed an interest in such an undertaking. Up to this time, there have been no funds available for the establishment of this national service bureau. The University of Maryland had effected a savings under the original grant from the Ford Foundation, and has sought to interest other agencies in the continuation of the work begun under the original grant. The NAPSAE, Washington, D. C. office was approached on this special project, and NAPSAE has agreed to establish a new position in its Washington, D. C. office for the coordination of adult basic education training activities.

NAPSAE is uniquely qualified to service this special project because of its role in intiating the Summer 1965 Workshops, its continuing efforts to provide an information exchange among adult basic education programs in the public school systems, and its unique role as a national association with direct lines of communication to those who are doing the bulk of adult basic education in the country.

NAPSAE has signed a letter of agreement with the University of Maryland to perform the activities described above, and to submit a final summary report of these activities by June 30, 1968. The actual operation of the office of coordination of adult basic education training activities will be funded for one year through the modification of the Ford Foundation grant to the University of Maryland.

V. PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY

I.	Project Funding: [1]			
	A. Inter-University Workshop		$78,500.00	
	B. Supplemental Activities		13,000.00	
	Total Funding Available			$91,500.00
II.	Project Expenses:			
	A. Total Project Administration [2]			
	1. Salaries, Wages, Benefits	$ 9,567.48		
	2. Operating Expenses	4,526.41		
			14,093.89	
	B. Inter-University Workshop - Direct Charges			
	1. Consultant Fees	$ 6,778.00		
	2. Operating Expenses	32,526.93		
			39,304.93	
	C. Publication of Guide			
	1. Consultant Fees	$ 2,662.50		
	2. Operating Expenses	6,706.51		
			9,369.01	
	D. Field Evaluations			
	1. Staff, Consultant Fees	$ 696.76		
	2. Operating Expenses	3,585.41		
			4,282.17	
	E. Project for the establishment of the position of coordinator of adult basic education training activities serviced by the NAPSAE, Washington, D. C. office, to continue the work of the 1965 "Trainers of Trainers' Workshops"		15,900.00	
	F. University Management Expenses			
	1. Inter-University Workshop	$ 7,500.00		
	2. Supplemental Activities	1,050.00		
			8,550.00	
	Total Project Expenses			$91,500.00

[1]Three "Trainers of Trainers'" Workshops were conducted under similar grants from the Ford Foundation in the Summer of 1965. The total Ford Foundation funding for the project is shown below:

University of New Mexico	
(2-week workshop for 20 participants)	$ 22,500
University of Washington	
(2-week workshop for 29 participants)	25,600
University of Maryland	
(2-week workshop for 106 participants and subsequent activities)	91,500
Total Ford Foundation Funding	$139,600

[2]The Project Administration Expenses cover the total project from April, 1965 to December, 1966. These expenses were not pro-rated over the various activities performed under the grants.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard P. Oliver
Project Administrator

"TRAINERS OF TRAINERS' WORKSHOPS" IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION
DEMONSTRATION AND SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITIES

PROJECT BUDGET -- ACCOUNTING

BUDGET CATEGORY	Total Project Administration	Inter-University Workshop	Publication of Guide	Field Evaluations	TOTALS
I. PROJECT FUNDING					
A. Inter-University Workshop					7[illegible].00
B. Supplemental Activities					1,[illegible].00
I. TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE					[illegible]
II. PROJECT EXPENSES					
A. Salaries, Wages, Benefits					
1. Project Administration					
a. Project Director	4,104.53				4,[illegible]
b. Asst. Proj. Director	3,000.00				3,000.00
c. Secretarial Assistant	2,339.43				2,[illegible]
d. Part-Time Staff	931.33			82.76	1,[illegible]
2. Staff, Consultant Fees					
a. Staff Participants		6,703.00			6,703.00
b. Baltimore Teachers		75.00			75.00
c. Publication Consultants			2,662.50		2,662.50
d. Evaluation Consultants				614.00	614.00
3. Staff Benefits	202.24				202.24
A. Sub-Totals	10,577.53	6,778.00	2,662.50	696.76	19,[illegible]
B. Operating Expenses					
1. Office Space	1,830.25				1,830.25
2. Equipment Rental	153.35				153.35
3. Supplies	637.60				637.60
4. A.M.A. Conference Fees	150.00				150.00
5. Food Service	6.90	8,293.05			8,299.95
6. Meeting Space		990.00			990.00
7. Lodging		5,714.49			5,714.49
8. Printing & Duplicating		310.65		95.41	406.06
9. Communication	768.60	642.96			1,411.56

2. Equipment Rental	153.35				153.35
3. Supplies	637.60				637.60
4. A.M.A. Conference Fees	150.00				150.00
5. Food Service	6.90	8,293.05			8,299.95
6. Meeting Space		990.00			990.00
7. Lodging		5,714.49			5,714.49
8. Printing & Duplicating		310.05		95.43	405.48
9. Communications	768.60	142.06			910.66
10. Workshop Materials		396.29			396.29
11. Audio Visual Equip. Rental		328.25			328.25
12. Field Trips		1,117.00			1,117.00
13. Travel	111.50	12,154.51	551.24		12,817.25
14. NAPSAE:					
Observers at Workshops		1,070.30			1,070.30
Reunion Dinner at N.Y. Conference	835.10				835.10
Publication of Guide			6,155.27		6,155.27
15. Computer Services				3,500.00	3,500.00
16. Materials - Final Report	33.11				33.11
B. Sub-Totals	4,526.41	32,526.93	6,706.51	3,595.43	47,355.28
C. Project for the establishment of the position of coordinator of adult basic education training activities, serviced by the NAPSAE, Washington, D. C. office, to continue the work of the 1965 "Trainer of Trainers' Workshops"	15,900.00				15,900.00
D. General University Management Expenses					
1. Inter-University Workshop	7,500.00				7,500.00
2. Supplemental Activities	1,050.00				1,050.00
II. TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES	38,543.89	39,304.93	9,369.01	4,232.17	91,449.99

APPENDIX A

SUMMER 1965 WORKSHOPS' PARTICIPANT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Name .....

School .....

Title .....

To assist in evaluating [illegible] the purpose of this evaluation questionnaire. Please answer the following questions carefully and answer each question as accurately as possible. Your responses will have direct bearing on the advancement of adult basic education programs in our country.

1. What is your present responsibility in adult basic education?

   ___ 1. None
   ___ 2. Teacher
   ___ 3. Administrator
   ___ 4. Supervisor
   ___ 5. Teacher Trainer
   ___ 6. Other .....

2. Which 1965 Workshops for the "training of trainers" of teachers of the Undereducated Adult did you attend?

   ___ 1. New Mexico
   ___ 2. Seattle, Washington
   ___ 3. Maryland

3. What is your present recollection of the primary objectives of that Workshop?

   ___ 1. To help me understand disadvantaged adults
   ___ 2. To prepare me as a teacher of undereducated adults
   ___ 3. To prepare me to train teachers to teach adults
   ___ 4. To give me administrative skills in adult basic education
   ___ 5. To help me supervise teaching programs in adult basic education
   ___ 6. Other .....

4. As you [illegible] it, to what extent did the Workshop meet those objectives?

   ___ 1. Not at all
   ___ 2. Some
   ___ 3. 50-50
   ___ 4. Quite well
   ___ 5. Completely

5. Please indicate [illegible] the strengths and the greatest weaknesses of the Workshop [illegible]. (Give in order of importance)

Strengths	Weaknesses
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.

7 Since the Workshop started, how often have you used the following sources of information? (Please circle the number of the appropriate response in each case.)

	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
1	1	2	3
2	1	2	3
3	1	2	3
4	1	2	3
5	1	2	3

8. Please rate the Workshop facilities in terms of the following: (Please circle the number of the appropriate response.)

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
a. length of time devoted to each lecture	1	2	3	4
b. the choice of material to record	1	2	3	4
c. the method of presentation of materials	1	2	3	4
d. the use of audio-visual equipment and facilities in lectures	1	2	3	4
e. the use of audio-visual equipment and facilities in practical sessions	1	2	3	4
f. the physical facilities	1	2	3	4

5. Do you feel adequately prepared to [illegible] the following [illegible] in your college?

	Have you had adequate training in your college to prepare you adequately?		Are you receiving adequate training in your college at present?		Are you receiving adequate training in your college at present?	
	(a) Yes or No	(b) Yes	(b) No	(c) Yes	(c) No	
a. [illegible]						
1) [illegible]						
2) [illegible]						
3) [illegible]						
4) [illegible]						
5) [illegible]						
6) [illegible]						
7) [illegible]						
8) [illegible]						
9) [illegible]						
10) [illegible]						
b. [illegible]						
1) [illegible]						
2) [illegible]						
3) [illegible]						
4) [illegible]						
c. [illegible]						
1) [illegible]						
2) [illegible]						
3) [illegible]						
4) [illegible]						
5) [illegible]						
6) [illegible]						
7) [illegible]						

APPENDIX B

STATE WORKSHOPS' PARTICIPANT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

The enclosed covering letter describes the purpose of this evaluation questionnaire. Your fullest cooperation in assisting us with the completion of this task would be appreciated. Please answer all the questions with a checkmark (✓).

1. State: _____

2. Training Agency or Institution:

   _____1. State Department of Education
   _____2. Local School System
   _____3. College or University
   _____4. Private
   _____5. Other

3. Are you employed in an adult basic education program?

   _____1. Yes _____2. No

4. If answer to No. 3 is Yes:

   _____1. Full-time _____2. Part-time What type of program? _____

5. Your age

   _____1. Under 21
   _____2. 21-25
   _____3. 26-30
   _____4. 31-45
   _____5. 46-60
   _____6. Over 60

6. Sex:

   _____1. Male _____2. Female

7. Your highest level of education completed:

   _____1. Less than high school
   _____2. High school
   _____3. College

      _____a. 1-2 years
      _____b. 3-4 years
      _____c. 5-6 years
      _____d. 7 or more years

8. College degrees held

   _____1. Associate
   _____2. Bachelors
   _____3. Masters
   _____4. Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.)

9. Major area of university training.

Specify _____

10. Have you attended other Adult Basic Education Training Programs?

_____1. Yes _____2. No

11. If answer to No. 10 is Yes:

1. How many programs _____

When?

_____1. Past year
_____2. Past 3 years
_____3. More than 3 years ago

12. Current position in Adult Basic Education:

_____1. Teacher
_____2. Supervisor
_____3. Counselor
_____4. Trainer of Teachers
_____5. State Administrator
_____6. Other

13. How well do you think the Adult Basic Education program which you attended prepared you for your role in adult basic education?

_____1. Very well
_____2. Adequately
_____3. Inadequately

14. Teaching experience by grade.

_____1. None
_____2. Pre-school
_____3. 1-3
_____4. 4-6
_____5. 7-9
_____6. 10-12
_____7. College
_____8. Supervisory

15. Total teaching and supervisory experience at all levels:

_____1. None
_____2. 1-5 years
_____3. 6-10 years
_____4. 11-15 years
_____5. 16-20 years
_____6. over 20 years

16. Do you hold an active teaching certificate or license?

_____1. Yes _____2. No

17. Have you ever been a volunteer in an adult basic education program?

_____1. Yes _____2. No

18. How many years have you worked with the undereducated adult?

_____1. None
_____2. 1-5
_____3. 6-10
_____4. 11-15
_____5. 16-20
_____6. over 20

19. The following statements refer to the organization, operation, and impact of the program in adult basic education which you attended. Please answer each question, unless the specific area was not covered in your program.

	Adult Basic Education Program (check one)			Was this important to you? (check one)		Adequate time allotted? (check one)	
	Good	Fair	Poor	Yes	No	Yes	No
Facilities and Arrangements	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Availability of Materials	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Program Content	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Use of visual aids	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Use of innovative teacher-training techniques	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Participant-Staff interaction	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Curriculum:							
1) Arithmetic Instruction	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
2) Reading Instruction	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
3) Citizenship Instruction	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
4) Consumer Education	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
5) Job Orientation	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Information and Skills:							
1) On Non-English Speaking adults	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
2) Psychology-Sociology of Disadvantaged	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
3) Adult Learning Theory	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
4) Counseling, Testing, and Guidance of Undereducated Adult	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
5) Recruitment of students	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
6) Motivation and Retention of Students	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
7) Grouping of Students	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
8) Selection of teaching materials	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
9) Construction of Teaching materials	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
10) Use of Teaching Materials	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

	Adult Basic Education Program (check one)			Was this important to you? (check one)		Adequate time allotted? (check one)	
	Good	Fair	Poor	Yes	No	Yes	No
i. Availability of Resources:							
1) General Consultants on teaching methods	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
2) Guidance, counseling, and social service	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
3) Health services available	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
4) Welfare services available	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
5) Employment services available	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
6) Use of library	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
7) Use of volunteers	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

20. What are the major unresolved problems you face in working with the undereducated adult?

_____1. Recruiting of students
_____2. Establishing rapport with students
_____3. Motivating students
_____4. Testing and Grouping students
_____5. Counseling students
_____6. Proper choice of materials
_____7. Proper use of materials
_____8. Availability of materials
_____9. Inadequate teacher training
_____10. Lack of administrative support
_____11. Availability of supporting services (Health, Welfare, Employment, etc,)
_____12. Availability or adequacy of classroom space
_____13. Other _____
specify

21. Length of the adult basic education training program in which you participated?

_____1. 1-10 hours
_____2. 10-20 hours
_____3. 20-40 hours
_____4. 40-60 hours
_____5. 60-80 hours
_____6. over 80 hours

22. Was this training period adequate?

_____1. Very adequate
_____2. Moderately adequate
_____3. Adequate to some degree
_____4. Inadequate

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAR 6 1969
on Adult Education

END

12-10-68